



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/873,382

06/05/2001

Jin-Ho Lee

030681-305

4610

21839

7590

10/28/2002

BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

TAMAI, KARL I

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/873,382

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Tamai IE Karl

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
3. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Drawings

5. Photographs, including photocopies of photographs, are not ordinarily permitted in utility and design patent applications. (See 37 CFR 1.84). The Applicant is required to replace the photographs with a drawing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-5, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Victor (JP 2000-418429) and Ahn et al. (Ahn)(US 6,116,863). Victor teaches an electrostatic microactuator with a base plate with a prearranged pattern of signal lines for fixed comb shaped electrodes. The fixed combs driving movable comb electrodes on a stage supported by torsion bars for see-saw motion. Victor shows in figure 15 that the electrodes extend to the bottom of the first frame. Victor does not teach an eutectic bonding layer between the upper and lower frames. Ahn teaches that eutectic bonding is one of several bonding methods for securing frames/substrates in a MEMS device. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to construct the actuator of Victor with the frames secured by an eutectic bond because Ahn teaches it is the preferred mode to bond MEM frames, and it is within the ordinary skill in the art to choose between known equivalents means of bonding.

8. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Victor (JP 2000-418429) and Ahn et al. (Ahn)(US 6,116,863), in further view of Nakagawa (JP 5-76186)). Victor and Ahn teach every aspect of the invention except the electrodes extending above the second frame. Nakagawa teaches the electrodes interdigital and coplanar with the stage. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to construct the actuator of Victor and Ahn with the fixed electrodes above the second frame to be coplanar with the stage/moving electrodes to generate a good electrostatic driving force.

9. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Victor (JP 2000-418429) and Ahn et al. (Ahn)(US 6,116,863), in further view of Nishiguchi (US 5,064,782). Victor and Ahn teach every aspect of the invention except the multiplayer eutectic bond with the middle layer being Au/Sn. Nishiguchi teaches the multiplayer eutectic bond with the middle layer being Au/Sn to improve the eutectic adhesion between the frames. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to construct the actuator of Victor and Ahn with the multiplayer eutectic bond with the middle layer being Au/Sn to improve the eutectic adhesion between the frames.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl I.E. Tamai whose telephone number is (703)

Art Unit: 2834

305-7066. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Nestor Ramirez, can be reached at (703) 308-1371. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 308-0956.

Karl I Tamai
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
October 24, 2002



KARL TAMAI
PRIMARY EXAMINER